

REMARKS

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-5 and 7-11 are currently pending in the application. Claim 3 stands rejected. The Examiner objects to claim 6 for being of improper dependent form. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 7-11 are allowed. Claim 3 has been amended as set forth herein. Claim 6 has been cancelled herein. All amendments and cancellations are made without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter has been added by way of the present amendments. Specifically, the amendment to claim 3 is supported by the specification at page 23, line 11 to page 24, line 10. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Objections to the Drawings

The Examiner objects to the drawings as failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(p)(5) as reciting a reference character not discussed in the description. (*See*, Office Action of May 10, 2006, at page 2, hereinafter, "Office Action"). The Examiner specifically states that reference character 2 in Figures 1, 2 and 3 is not adequately described in the specification and that part (1) of these figures has been labeled both a nozzle and a joint at page 14 of the specification.

The specification, at the paragraph beginning at page 14, line 8, has been amended to recite that part (2) is a fixing bolt, as is evidenced by the as-filed Figures, especially Figures 1-5. Furthermore, this same paragraph has been amended to remove the erroneous recitation of part (1) following the word "nozzle."

No new matter has been introduced to the specification by way of these amendments.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is respectfully requested.

Objections to the Claims

The Examiner objects to claim 6 under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(c) as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. The Examiner states that claim 6 does not further limit the scope of claim 4. Claim 6 has been cancelled herein without prejudice or disclaimer, thus obviating the objection to claim 6.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. (*See*, Office Action, at page 2). Applicants traverse the rejection as set forth herein.

The Examiner states that it is not clear what limitations are imposed on the number average molecular weight (M_n) of the polymer.

Although Applicants do not agree that claim 3 is indefinite, to expedite prosecution, claim 3 has been amended to further clarify the meaning of the phrase “is not higher than 0.47 per molecular chain.” Claim 3 has been amended to recite in part [n2], the following: “the number of terminal vinyl groups (V) per molecular chain is not higher than 0.47 per molecular chain and is calculated from the number of terminal vinyl groups [v (/1000C)] per 1000 carbon atoms measured by IR and number-average molecular weight (M_n) measured by GPC.” Thus, as amended, it is clear that the phrase “is not higher than 0.47 per molecular chain” modifies that

phrase "the number of terminal vinyl groups (V) per molecular chain." This amendment is a non-narrowing amendment.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the indefiniteness rejection of claim 3 is respectfully requested.


CONCLUSION

If the Examiner has any questions or comments, please contact Thomas J. Siepmann, Ph.D., Registration No 57,374 at the offices of Birch, Stewart, Kolasch & Birch, LLP.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to our Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: September 11, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Marc S. Weiner
Registration No.: 32,181
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicants